



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,286	06/30/2000	John S. Hendricks	5219.00	2646

7590

06/27/2003

John K Harrop
Dorsey & Whitney LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 300 South
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/609,286

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 4/30/03

This action is final.

2. Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 18, and 22 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 4/30/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by DeNicola et al. (US 6,288,753).

As per independent claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches in a computer system having a digital processor, input means and a display monitor, apparatus for displaying related information, comprising (col 7, lines 38-60):

an information source having a plurality of information representations including at least one of images, descriptors, or sounds, wherein the information representations are interconnected by a plurality of information links (fig 5, learning Center, On Air...);

a processor routine operating on the digital processor, the processor routine (i) receiving the information representations from the information source, (ii) forming a first screen view of

Art Unit: 2174

the information representations, and (iii) displaying the formed screen view on the display monitor in a manner supporting user interaction (col 15, lines 62-67, col 16, lines 1-32); and

an I/O assembly coupled to the processor routine and responsive to the input means as operated by a user, wherein through the input means, with the displayed screen view activating at least one of the information links, the processor routine forms a next screen view displaying the information, representations simultaneously changing states as a function of the user interaction (col 14, lines 17-21, lines 55-65, col 15, lines 35-45). The examiner is inferring that the user can logon as a student, a client, a client administrator, or as someone else, where each statue provides user with different options and views.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein each screen view has a plurality of graphical areas responsive to the input means, wherein in response to user interaction with a graphical area, the processor routine forms a first alternate screen view and displays the formed first alternate screen view on the display monitor in a manner supporting user interaction (fig 5, learning Center, On Air....).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the processor routine forms each screen view as a function of an associated screen view mode, wherein a screen view mode is selected from a group including basic and advanced modes(col 14, lines 17-21, lines 55-65). The examiner is inferring to that the user can logon as a student or a client where each statue provide user with different options and views.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the digital processor is connected to an information network

Art Unit: 2174

having remote information sources including remote information representations interconnected by remote information links, said processor routine (i) accessing the remote information sources (fig 5, learning Center, On Air....), (ii) receiving the remote information representations and remote information links from the remote information sources (fig 6, Student access, Learning objects), (iii) forming a next screen view having local and remote information representations (fig 6, Student access, Learning objects), and (iv) displaying the formed screen view on the display monitor in a manner supporting user interaction, with the displayed screen view activating at least one of a local or remote information link (fig 6, Student access, Learning objects).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the digital processor is connected to an information network having remote information sources including remote information representations interconnected by remote information links, said processor routine (i) accessing the remote information sources (fig 5, learning Center, On Air....), (ii) receiving the remote information representations and remote information links from the remote information sources (fig 6, Student access, Learning objects), and (iii) updating a subset of the local information representations and local information links with a subset of remote information representations and remote information links (col 16, lines 6-31).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the processor routine includes an image generator routine having a step size variable, wherein images included in the information source provide image via points, said image generator routine (fig 3, Remit to Maintenance) (i) forming a series of images

Art Unit: 2174

spanning between said image via points as a function of the step size variable (col 5, lines 30-49), (ii) forming information links interconnecting each image in the generated series of images and the generated series of images to associated via points (col 5, lines 30-49), (iii) updating the information source to include the generated series of images (col 5, lines 30-49). The examiner is inferring to the real time video/audio signal as the series of images.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the digital processor is connected to an information network, wherein for a remote computer system having a remote processor coupled to a respective processor routine, input means, display monitor, and I/O assembly, the digital processor (fig2, item 66, 62) (i) forming information source packets (fig 2, item 34, 32, 40) and (ii) transmitting the information source packets to the remote computer (fig 2, item 66, 62).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 8, wherein the remote processor receives the information source packets, said respective processor routine (fig2, item 66, 62) (i) parsing the information source packets (ii) forming a remote screen view of the parsed information representations (fig3, at the bottom of the screen "done"), and (iii) displaying the formed remote screen view on the respective display monitor in a manner supporting remote user interaction (fig3, at the bottom of the screen "done"). The examiner is inferring that the statue bar indicates how much of the web data is being loaded.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 9, wherein for the remote I/O assembly coupled to the remote processor routine and responsive to the respective input means as operated by the remote user, wherein

Art Unit: 2174

through the respective input means, with the displayed remote screen view activating at least one of the information links, the respective processor routine forms a next screen view displaying the parsed information representations dynamically as a function of the remote user interaction.

(fig2, item 66, 62, fig3, at the bottom of the screen "done"). The examiner is inferring to the fact that the statue bar indicates how much of the web data is being loaded.

As per independent claim 11, DeNicola et al. teaches in a computer system having a digital processor, input means and a display monitor, a method for displaying related information, comprising (col 7, lines 38-60):

(i) receiving the information representations from an information source, the information source having a plurality of information representations including at least one of images, descriptors, or sounds, wherein the information representations are interconnected by a plurality of information links (fig 5, learning Center, On Air....) ;

(ii) forming a first screen view of the information representations;

(iii) displaying the formed screen view on the display monitor in a manner supporting user interaction (col 15, lines 62-67, col 16, lines 1-32); and

(iv) responsive to the input means as operated by a user and with the displayed screen view activating at least one of the information links, forming a next screen view displaying the information representations simultaneously changing states as a function of the user interaction. (col 14, lines 17-21, lines 55-65, col 15, lines 35-45). The examiner that the user can logon as a student, a client, a client administrator, or as someone else, where each statue provide user with different options and views.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (see rejection above)

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (see rejection above)

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above)

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 9. (see rejection above)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 10. (see rejection above)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeNicola et al.(US 6,288,753) in view of Papadopoulos(US 6099,320).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, DeNicola et al. teaches the apparatus according to Claim 1. However DeNicola et al. doesn't teach the apparatus further comprising a text-to-audio synthesizer coupled to the processor routine, wherein the text-to-audio synthesizer converts a subset of descriptors into speech for the user. Papadopoulos teaches an apparatus comprising a text-to-audio synthesizer coupled to the processor routine, wherein the text-to-audio synthesizer converts a subset of descriptors into speech for the user (col 5, lines 50-62). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Papadopoulos's teaching with DeNicola et al.'s method in order to improve student's retention.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/30/03, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments include the following:

A. Lanier doesn't disclose or suggest "receiving one or more virtual objects; receiving a video program including one or more virtual object location, ...comparing the virtual object

information and the received virtual objects to select virtual objects for placement in the virtual object location; and inserting the selected virtual object in to the virtual object location”.

B. Lanier and Lanier ‘139, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest storing virtual object in the viewer’s terminals.

Examiner disagrees.

A. Lanier teaches “receiving one or more virtual objects...” by allowing user to receive data flow from the network (col 3, lines 5-20), he then teaches “comparing the virtual object information... and inserting the selected virtual object” by automatically altering the virtual data to correspond with the virtual changes (col 3, lines 5-20), and allowing user to define his/her object in the virtual world (col 2, lines 46-68)

B. Lanier’ 139 teaches storing virtual object in the viewer’s terminal. Lanier teaches passing the virtual data to a user’s terminal (paragraph 30), which is illustrated in detail in figure 4 of the reference (It is inherent that the display data will be stored within the display buffer of the user’s terminal before it is displayed on the user’s screen).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2174

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (703) 305-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE L KINCAID can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Peng Ke
June 24, 2003

STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER